

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-15 were rejected. With this Amendment, claim 1 was amended. Accordingly, claims 1-15 are at issue in the above-identified application.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Worster et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,479,252) in view of *Xu et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,761,336). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Worster et al.* and *Xu et al.* as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of *Aloni et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,619,429). Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Worster et al.* and *Xu et al.* as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of an article entitled "*All-Solid-State Tunable Ultraviolet Ce Activated Fluoride Laser Systems Directly Pumped by the Fourth and Fifth Harmonic of Nd: YAG Lasers*" by *Liu et al.* ("Liu"). Claims 11-13 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Worster et al.* and *Xu et al.* as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of *Novak* (U.S. Patent No. 4,514,858). Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Worster et al.*, *Xu et al.* and *Novak* as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of *Aloni et al.* Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Amended claim 1, from which claims 2-15 depend, recites an inspection equipment comprising means for supporting a specimen, means for projecting an ultraviolet light, an ultraviolet imaging means, means for projecting a visible light, visible light imaging means, means for processing images, and means for automatically selecting between the images picked

up by ultraviolet imaging means and the visible light imaging means in response to *the defect size of the specimen, the wavelength of the ultraviolet light emitted by the means for projecting an ultraviolet light, and the numerical aperture of the ultraviolet objective lens*. None of the above-cited references, either alone or in combination, teach or even suggest inspection equipment that has means for *automatically* selecting between images picked up by an *ultraviolet imaging means* and a *visible light imaging means* in response to a defect size of a specimen. For example, the *Worster et al.* reference describes a laser imaging system 100 having a laser scanning microscopic optics head including a laser, a confocal beam scanning optics, and ultraviolet and visible photo detection electronics, together with commercial microscope components. (See *Worster et al.*, column 6, lines 4-15.) *Worster et al.* requires an *operator* to select between viewing the image using white light conventional microscope optics, real-time laser scanning optics, or both laser and white light optics simultaneously. However, unlike the claimed invention, *Worster et al.* does not *automatically* select between images picked up by an ultraviolet imaging means and a visible light imaging means. *Xu et al.* is concerned with *characterizing defects* and therefore discloses only one type of imaging means, an imaging system 100, that has a *single* light source 137. *Xu et al.* does not teach or even suggest how one would go about switching between two types of imaging means projecting two types of light sources. Therefore, *Xu et al.* fails to teach or disclose means for automatically selecting between the images picked up by ultraviolet imaging means and the visible light imaging means in response to *the defect size of the specimen, the wavelength of the ultraviolet light emitted by the means for projecting an ultraviolet light, and the numerical aperture of the ultraviolet objective lens*.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claim invention is neither anticipated by nor obvious over the applied references, either alone or in combination. Withdrawal of these grounds of rejection is respectfully requested. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested.

Dated: July 6, 2004

By: _____

Respectfully submitted,


David Rozenblat

Registration No. 47,044

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

P.O. Box 061080

Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080

(312) 876-8000